

1
2
3
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4

5 STEPHEN B. TURNER,

No. C 12-5258 YGR (PR)

6 Petitioner,

**ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT'S MOTION
TO DISMISS PETITION; AND DENYING
CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**7 v.
8 JEFFREY BEARD, Secretary of California
9 Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation,
10 Respondent.

(Docket Nos. 5, 7, 9)

11
12 **INTRODUCTION**

Petitioner Stephen B. Turner, a former inmate who is currently serving a term of parole following his release from prison on January 5, 2010, filed a *pro se* action for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Before the Court is Respondent's¹ motion to dismiss the instant petition as untimely under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d), the statute of limitations set by the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA"). Petitioner has filed an unopposed motion to withdraw the second claim asserted in his petition, which the Court GRANTS. Petitioner has also filed an unopposed motion for a ruling on his petition, which the Court also GRANTS.

For the reasons discussed below, the Court GRANTS Respondent's motion to dismiss the petition as untimely.

23
24 **BACKGROUND**

On January 4, 2010, Petitioner was released from prison and placed on parole. One of the conditions of his parole prohibited him from possessing or viewing pornography. On May 13, 2011,

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
55210
55211
55212
55213
55214
55215
55216
55217
55218
55219
55220
55221
55222
55223
55224
55225
55226
55227
55228
55229
55230
55231
55232
55233
55234
55235
55236
55237
55238
55239
55240
55241
55242
55243
55244
55245
55246
55247
55248
55249
55250
55251
55252
55253
55254
55255
55256
55257
55258
55259
55260
55261
55262
55263
55264
55265
55266
55267
55268
55269
55270
55271
55272
55273
55274
55275
55276
55277
55278
55279
55280
55281
55282
55283
55284
55285
55286
55287
55288
55289
55290
55291
55292
55293
55294
55295
55296
55297
55298
55299
552100
552101
552102
552103
552104
552105
552106
552107
552108
552109
552110
552111
552112
552113
552114
552115
552116
552117
552118
552119
552120
552121
552122
552123
552124
552125
552126
552127
552128
552129
552130
552131
552132
552133
552134
552135
552136
552137
552138
552139
552140
552141
552142
552143
552144
552145
552146
552147
552148
552149
552150
552151
552152
552153
552154
552155
552156
552157
552158
552159
552160
552161
552162
552163
552164
552165
552166
552167
552168
552169
552170
552171
552172
552173
552174
552175
552176
552177
552178
552179
552180
552181
552182
552183
552184
552185
552186
552187
552188
552189
552190
552191
552192
552193
552194
552195
552196
552197
552198
552199
552200
552201
552202
552203
552204
552205
552206
552207
552208
552209
552210
552211
552212
552213
552214
552215
552216
552217
552218
552219
552220
552221
552222
552223
552224
552225
552226
552227
552228
552229
5522210
5522211
5522212
5522213
5522214
5522215
5522216
5522217
5522218
5522219
5522220
5522221
5522222
5522223
5522224
5522225
5522226
5522227
5522228
5522229
55222210
55222211
55222212
55222213
55222214
55222215
55222216
55222217
55222218
55222219
55222220
55222221
55222222
55222223
55222224
55222225
55222226
55222227
55222228
55222229
552222210
552222211
552222212
552222213
552222214
552222215
552222216
552222217
552222218
552222219
552222220
552222221
552222222
552222223
552222224
552222225
552222226
552222227
552222228
552222229
5522222210
5522222211
5522222212
5522222213
5522222214
5522222215
5522222216
5522222217
5522222218
5522222219
5522222220
5522222221
5522222222
5522222223
5522222224
5522222225
5522222226
5522222227
5522222228
5522222229
55222222210
55222222211
55222222212
55222222213
55222222214
55222222215
55222222216
55222222217
55222222218
55222222219
55222222220
55222222221
55222222222
55222222223
55222222224
55222222225
55222222226
55222222227
55222222228
55222222229
552222222210
552222222211
552222222212
552222222213
552222222214
552222222215
552222222216
552222222217
552222222218
552222222219
552222222220
552222222221
552222222222
552222222223
552222222224
552222222225
552222222226
552222222227
552222222228
552222222229
5522222222210
5522222222211
5522222222212
5522222222213
5522222222214
5522222222215
5522222222216
5522222222217
5522222222218
5522222222219
5522222222220
5522222222221
5522222222222
5522222222223
5522222222224
5522222222225
5522222222226
5522222222227
5522222222228
5522222222229
55222222222210
55222222222211
55222222222212
55222222222213
55222222222214
55222222222215
55222222222216
55222222222217
55222222222218
55222222222219
55222222222220
55222222222221
55222222222222
55222222222223
55222222222224
55222222222225
55222222222226
55222222222227
55222222222228
55222222222229
552222222222210
552222222222211
552222222222212
552222222222213
552222222222214
552222222222215
552222222222216
552222222222217
552222222222218
552222222222219
552222222222220
552222222222221
552222222222222
552222222222223
552222222222224
552222222222225
552222222222226
552222222222227
552222222222228
552222222222229
5522222222222210
5522222222222211
5522222222222212
5522222222222213
5522222222222214
5522222222222215
5522222222222216
5522222222222217
5522222222222218
5522222222222219
5522222222222220
5522222222222221
5522222222222222
5522222222222223
5522222222222224
5522222222222225
5522222222222226
5522222222222227
5522222222222228
5522222222222229
55222222222222210
55222222222222211
55222222222222212
55222222222222213
55222222222222214
55222222222222215
55222222222222216
55222222222222217
55222222222222218
55222222222222219
55222222222222220
55222222222222221
55222222222222222
55222222222222223
55222222222222224
55222222222222225
55222222222222226
55222222222222227
55222222222222228
55222222222222229
552222222222222210
552222222222222211
552222222222222212
552222222222222213
552222222222222214
552222222222222215
552222222222222216
552222222222222217
552222222222222218
552222222222222219
552222222222222220
552222222222222221
552222222222222222
552222222222222223
552222222222222224
552222222222222225
552222222222222226
552222222222222227
552222222222222228
552222222222222229
5522222222222222210
5522222222222222211
5522222222222222212
5522222222222222213
5522222222222222214
5522222222222222215
5522222222222222216
5522222222222222217
5522222222222222218
5522222222222222219
5522222222222222220
5522222222222222221
5522222222222222222
5522222222222222223
5522222222222222224
5522222222222222225
5522222222222222226
5522222222222222227
5522222222222222228
5522222222222222229
55222222222222222210
55222222222222222211
55222222222222222212
55222222222222222213
55222222222222222214
55222222222222222215
55222222222222222216
55222222222222222217
55222222222222222218
55222222222222222219
55222222222222222220
55222222222222222221
55222222222222222222
55222222222222222223
55222222222222222224
55222222222222222225
55222222222222222226
55222222222222222227
55222222222222222228
55222222222222222229
552222222222222222210
552222222222222222211
552222222222222222212
552222222222222222213
552222222222222222214
552222222222222222215
552222222222222222216
552222222222222222217
552222222222222222218
552222222222222222219
552222222222222222220
552222222222222222221
552222222222222222222
552222222222222222223
552222222222222222224
552222222222222222225
552222222222222222226
552222222222222222227
552222222222222222228
552222222222222222229
5522222222222222222210
5522222222222222222211
5522222222222222222212
5522222222222222222213
5522222222222222222214
5522222222222222222215
5522222222222222222216
5522222222222222222217
5522222222222222222218
5522222222222222222219
5522222222222222222220
5522222222222222222221
5522222222222222222222
5522222222222222222223
5522222222222222222224
5522222222222222222225
5522222222222222222226
5522222222222222222227
5522222222222222222228
5522222222222222222229
55222222222222222222210
55222222222222222222211
55222222222222222222212
55222222222222222222213
55222222222222222222214
55222222222222222222215
55222222222222222222216
55222222222222222222217
55222222222222222222218
55222222222222222222219
55222222222222222222220
55222222222222222222221
55222222222222222222222
55222222222222222222223
55222222222222222222224
55222222222222222222225
55222222222222222222226
55222222222222222222227
55222222222222222222228
55222222222222222222229
552222222222222222222210
552222222222222222222211
552222222222222222222212
552222222222222222222213
552222222222222222222214
552222222222222222222215
552222222222222222222216
552222222222222222222217
552222222222222222222218
552222222222222222222219
552222222222222222222220
55222222222222222

1 after Petitioner was found to have downloaded pornography onto his computer, a special parole
2 condition was imposed prohibiting him from accessing the Internet. In this habeas petition,
3 Petitioner challenges this special condition as violating his constitutional rights.

4 Petitioner did not administratively challenge the special parole condition. He filed a state
5 habeas petition on September 22, 2011. Ex. 2, *In re Stephen Turner*, No. 162568 (Ala. Co. Sup. Ct.
6 Oct. 17, 2011) (Order Denying Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus). The Alameda County Superior
7 Court denied the petition on October 17, 2011. *Id.* On October 26, 2011, Petitioner filed a petition
8 for a writ of mandamus in the California Court of Appeal. Ex. 3. This petition was denied on
9 November 8, 2011. Ex. 4. On November 15, 2011, Petitioner filed a petition in the California
10 Supreme Court, which was denied on November 30, 2011. Exs. 5 and 6.

11 Petitioner filed a federal petition for a writ of habeas corpus on December 5, 2011. Ex. 7,
12 Case No. C 11-5828 YGR (PR). Respondent moved to dismiss the petition on several grounds,
13 including failure to exhaust administrative remedies because Petitioner had not alerted the state
14 courts that his claims were based on the United States Constitution or federal law. On September
15 14, 2012, finding that none of Petitioner's claims were exhausted, the Court dismissed the petition
16 without prejudice. Ex. 8. On September 24, 2012, Petitioner returned to the California Supreme
17 Court to exhaust state court remedies. Ex. 9. He filed the instant federal petition on October 11,
18 2012.

20 DISCUSSION

21 AEDPA, which became law on April 24, 1996, imposed a statute of limitations on petitions
22 for a writ of habeas corpus filed by state prisoners. Petitions filed by prisoners challenging
23 non-capital state convictions or sentences must be filed within one year of the latest date on which:
24 (A) the judgment became final after the conclusion of direct review or the time passed for seeking
25 direct review; (B) an impediment to filing an application created by unconstitutional state action was
26 removed, if such action prevented petitioner from filing; (C) the constitutional right asserted was
27 recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right was newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made
28 retroactive to cases on collateral review; or (D) the factual predicate of the claim could have been

1 discovered through the exercise of due diligence. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1).

2 Although the statute of limitations period has four possible starting dates, § 2244(d)(1)(D)
3 usually applies to prisoners challenging administrative decisions, such as the imposition of
4 Petitioner's special parole condition. Under § 2244(d)(1)(D), the limitations period runs from the
5 "date on which the factual predicate of the claim or claims presented could have been discovered
6 through the exercise of due diligence." *Hasan v. Galaza*, 254 F.3d 1150, 1154 n.3 (9th Cir. 2001).
7 Where there has been an administrative appeal, the one-year limitations period begins to run on the
8 date the administrative decision becomes final. *See Shelby v. Bartlett*, 391 F.3d 1061, 1066 (9th Cir.
9 2004) (limitations period began to run the day after prisoner received timely notice of the denial of
10 his administrative appeal challenging disciplinary decision).

11 The special parole condition at issue was imposed on May 13, 2011. Petitioner did not
12 administratively appeal this condition. Because Petitioner became aware of the factual predicate of
13 his claim on the date the special condition was imposed, the one-year statute of limitations began to
14 run on May 14, 2011, the day after its imposition. To meet the one-year statutory deadline, the
15 federal habeas petition had to be filed by May 14, 2012. This petition was filed on October 11,
16 2012. Therefore, unless tolling applies, this petition is untimely.

17 **I. Statutory Tolling**

18 AEDPA's one-year limitations period is tolled under § 2244(d)(2) for the "time during which
19 a properly filed application for State post-conviction or other collateral review [with respect to the
20 pertinent judgment or claim] is pending." *Dictado v. Ducharme*, 244 F.3d 724, 726 (9th Cir. 2001)
21 (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 2244 (d)(2)), *abrogated on other grounds by Pace v. DiGuglielmo*, 544 U.S.
22 408 (2005).

23 Petitioner filed his initial state petition on September 22, 2011, which is 132 days after the
24 statute of limitations began to run. The filing of this state petition began a period of statutory tolling
25 under § 2244(d)(2), which continued until November 30, 2011, the date the California Supreme
26 Court denied the petition he had filed on November 15, 2011.

27 Petitioner's first federal petition was filed on December 5, 2011 and was dismissed without

1 prejudice on September 14, 2012. The statute of limitations was not tolled under § 2244(d)(2)
2 during the time the petition was pending in federal court. *See Duncan v. Walker*, 533 U.S. 167, 181
3 (2001) (an application for federal habeas review is not an 'application for State post-conviction or
4 other collateral review' within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2)); *Jiminez v. Rice*, 276 F.3d
5 478, 482-83 (9th Cir. 2001) (pending federal habeas petition does not toll AEDPA limitations
6 period).

7 After this Court dismissed the federal habeas petition, Petitioner filed a second habeas
8 petition in the California Supreme Court on September 24, 2012. This was 299 days after the
9 California Supreme Court denied his first petition. Petitioner is not entitled to statutory tolling of the
10 299 days between his state supreme court petitions because his second petition was not properly
11 filed within the meaning of § 2244(d)(2). *See e.g. Evans v. Chavis*, 546 U.S. 189, 201 (2006)
12 (unexplained delay of six months before filing petition in California Supreme Court does not qualify
13 for statutory tolling under § 2244(d)(2) because it is much longer than the thirty to sixty day periods
14 most states provide for filing appeals of petitions to state supreme court); *Chaffer v. Prosper*, 592
15 F.3d 1046, 1048 (9th Cir. 2010) (per curiam) (101 and 115 days between state habeas petitions not
16 entitled to statutory tolling).

17 The untolled time—132 days from the day the statute began to run to the filing of the first
18 state petition, plus 299 days from the day the California Supreme Court denied the first petition to
19 the filing of the second petition—equals 431 days, well over the 365-day statute of limitations.
20 Therefore, unless equitable tolling applies, the petition is barred as untimely.

21 **II. Equitable Tolling**

22 AEDPA's statute of limitations is subject to equitable tolling in appropriate cases. *Holland v.*
23 *Florida*, 560 U.S. 631, 646-49 (2010). "When external forces, rather than a petitioner's lack of
24 diligence, account for the failure to file a timely claim, equitable tolling of the statute of limitations
25 may be appropriate." *Miles v. Prunty*, 187 F.3d 1104, 1107 (9th Cir. 1999). Equitable tolling will
26 not be available in most cases because extensions of time should be granted only if "extraordinary
27 circumstances" beyond a prisoner's control make it impossible to file a petition on time. *Id.* The
28

1 prisoner must show that "the 'extraordinary circumstances' were the cause of his untimeliness."
2 *Spitsyn v. Moore*, 345 F.3d 796, 799 (9th Cir. 2003) (citations omitted). Another statement of the
3 standard is that a litigant seeking equitable tolling bears the burden of establishing two elements:
4 "(1) that he has been pursuing his rights diligently, and (2) that some extraordinary circumstance
5 stood in his way," preventing timely filing. *Holland*, 560 U.S. at 649 (citation omitted); *accord*
6 *Rasberry v. Garcia*, 448 F.3d 1150, 1153 (9th Cir. 2006).

7 The Ninth Circuit has said that the petitioner "bears the burden of showing that this
8 extraordinary exclusion should apply to him." *Miranda v. Castro*, 292 F.3d 1063, 1065 (9th Cir.
9 2002). Indeed, "'the threshold necessary to trigger equitable tolling [under AEDPA] is very high,
10 lest the exceptions swallow the rule.'" *Id.* at 1066.

11 Petitioner argues that the time during which his first federal petition was pending in this
12 Court is equitably tolled because, "through no fault of his own, it took nearly a year for this Court to
13 notify [him] that he was required to fairly present his federal claims to the California Supreme Court.
14 Consequently, [Petitioner] should not be penalized for the delay simply because the U.S. District
15 Courts are backlogged." Opp'n at 3. However, as discussed below, the time the first federal habeas
16 petition was pending in this Court is not equitably tolled.

18 First, Petitioner's argument that this Court had a duty to notify him that he was required to
19 fairly present his claims to the state courts is without merit. It is not a district court's responsibility
20 to act as counsel and advise a petitioner on proper exhaustion procedures. *See Pliler v. Ford*, 542
21 U.S. 225, 231 (2004) (district judges have no duty to act as counsel to *pro se* litigants). Proper
22 exhaustion of state court remedies has been required since 1996, when AEDPA was enacted. *See* 28
23 U.S.C.

24 § 2254(b)(1)(A). Ignorance of the law, by itself, does not justify equitable tolling. *See Waldron-*
25 *Ramsey v. Pacholke*, 556 F.3d 1008, 1013 n.4 (9th Cir. 2009).

26 Second, equitable tolling is not warranted where a prior, completely unexhausted petition
27 was dismissed, as is the case here. *See* Ex. 8 at 7; *also see Rasberry v. Garcia*, 448 F.3d 1150, 1153
28 (9th Cir. 2006); *Jiminez v. Rice*, 276 F.3d 476, 481 (9th Cir. 2001) (once district court determines

1 that habeas petition contains only unexhausted claims, it need not inquire further as to petitioner's
2 intentions). Where the prior dismissed petition was completely unexhausted, the new petition does
3 not relate back. *Rasberry*, 448 F.3d at 1154-55; *Dils v. Small*, 260 F.3d 984, 986-87 (9th Cir. 2001).
4 Accordingly, under Ninth Circuit authority, the time during which Petitioner's first petition was
5 pending in this Court is not equitably tolled.

6 Nonetheless, Petitioner argues that the nine months his petition was pending in this Court is
7 equivalent to the extraordinary circumstances shown in *Roy v. Lampert*, 465 F.3d 964, 969 (9th Cir.
8 2006), *Herbst v. Cook*, 260 F.3d 1039, 1043 (9th Cir. 2001), *Spitsyn v. Moore*, 345 F.3d 796, 800
9 (9th Cir. 2003), and *Jefferson v. Budge*, 419 F.3d 1013 (9th Cir. 2005). These cases are
10 distinguishable.

11 In *Roy*, the Ninth Circuit remanded the case for an evidentiary hearing regarding whether the
12 allegations of a deficient prison law library met the extraordinary circumstances required for
13 equitable tolling. 465 F.3d at 974-75. In *Spitsyn*, the court held that equitable tolling applied where
14 an attorney, who was specifically retained to prepare and file a habeas petition, failed to do so, and
15 disregarded requests to return the files pertaining to the petitioner's case until long after the date the
16 petition was due. 345 F.3d at 798, 800. The circumstances pertaining to Petitioner's late-filing are
17 not equivalent to a deficient law library or the attorney's egregious misconduct addressed in *Spitsyn*.

18 In *Jefferson*, the court held that, when a mixed petition, containing exhausted and
19 unexhausted claims, is dismissed, the petitioner is entitled to equitable tolling from the date the first
20 habeas petition was dismissed until the date the petitioner files his exhausted petition. 419 F.3d at
21 1017. *Jefferson* does not apply to Petitioner's situation because his petition is not a mixed petition,
22 rather all of the claims in his first petition were unexhausted. Finally, in *Herbst*, the Ninth Circuit
23 held that a district habeas court could not *sua sponte* dismiss a petition on grounds of untimeliness
24 without providing adequate notice of the grounds for equitable as well as statutory tolling. 260 F.3d
25 at 1043-44. *Herbst* does not apply here because the Court did not *sua sponte* dismiss Petitioner's
26 first petition.

27 Thus, the authority Petitioner presents fails to support his argument that a petition pending

1 nine months in federal court qualifies as the extraordinary circumstances required for equitable
2 tolling. Indeed, the Supreme Court has noted that it is not unusual for a district court to take nine
3 months to rule on a motion to dismiss a habeas petition on procedural grounds. *See Duncan v.*
4 *Walker*, 533 U.S. 167, 184 (2001) (Stevens, J. concurring) (nine months is the average time district
5 courts take to dismiss federal petitions on procedural grounds). Therefore, this time-frame does not
6 constitute extraordinary circumstances.

7 Petitioner fails to acknowledge that his initial 132-day delay in filing his first habeas petition
8 in state Superior Court and his failure to exhaust the claims in his first federal petition caused him to
9 miss the one-year deadline. Even if Petitioner was unaware of the requirement of properly
10 exhausting his claims when he first filed his federal petition, he became aware of this requirement
11 after Respondent moved to dismiss the first petition for lack of exhaustion on April 6, 2012. At that
12 point, Petitioner had used only 260 days of AEDPA's 365-day statute of limitations and he could
13 have returned immediately to state court to exhaust his claims and re-filed his federal petition within
14 the one-year time limit. Instead, Petitioner chose to stay in federal court and pursue a procedurally
15 improper summary judgment motion. *See* Ex. 8 at 8.

16 Based on the above, equitable tolling does not apply because Petitioner has failed to carry his
17 burden of showing that extraordinary circumstances prevented the timely filing of his petition.
18 Accordingly, Respondent's motion to dismiss based on untimeliness is GRANTED.

19 **III. Certificate of Appealability**

20 The federal rules governing habeas cases brought by state prisoners have been amended to
21 require a district court that dismisses or denies a habeas petition to grant or deny a certificate of
22 appealability ("COA") in its ruling. *See* Rule 11(a), Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, 28 U.S.C. foll.
23 § 2254 (effective December 1, 2009). Section 2253(c)(1) applies to an appeal of a final order
24 entered on a procedural question antecedent to the merits, for instance a dismissal on statute of
25 limitations grounds. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483 (2000).

26 "Determining whether a COA should issue where the petition was dismissed on procedural
27 grounds has two components, one directed at the underlying constitutional claims and one directed
28

1 at the district court's procedural holding." *Id.* at 484-85. "When the district court denies a habeas
2 petition on procedural grounds without reaching the prisoner's underlying constitutional claim, a
3 COA should issue when the prisoner shows, at least, that jurists of reason would find it debatable
4 whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of
5 reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." *Id.* at
6 484; *see also James v. Giles*, 221 F.3d 1074, 1077 (9th Cir. 2000). As each of these components is a
7 "threshold inquiry," the federal court "may find that it can dispose of the application in a fair and
8 prompt manner if it proceeds first to resolve the issue whose answer is more apparent from the
9 record and arguments." *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 485. Supreme Court jurisprudence "allows and
10 encourages" federal courts to first resolve the procedural issue. *See id.*

11 The Court concludes that jurists of reason would not find it debatable whether Petitioner's
12 petition was untimely. Accordingly, a COA is DENIED.

13 **CONCLUSION**

14 For the reasons outlined above, the Court orders as follows:

15 1. Respondent's motion to dismiss the petition for a writ of habeas corpus is
16 GRANTED, and this action is DISMISSED with prejudice. Docket no. 5.

17 2. Petitioner's motions to withdraw the second claim in his petition and for a ruling on
18 his petition are granted. Docket Nos. 7 and 9.

19 2. The Court DENIES a COA.

20 3. The Clerk of the Court shall substitute Jeffrey Beard, Secretary of the California
21 Department Corrections and Rehabilitation, as Respondent pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, Rule 2(a).

22 4. The Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment, terminate all pending motions, and close
23 the file.

24 5. This Order terminates Docket Nos. 5, 7 and 9.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 DATED: March 4, 2014


YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE